

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 were pending at the time of the last Office Action. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 5-7 and canceled claim 3. Thus, claims 1, 2, and 4-26 are now pending.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for his consideration during the telephone interview of August 25, 2008. During that interview, applicant's representative described applicant's technology and discussed proposed amendments to claim 1. Applicant has amended claim 1 as discussed during the interview.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Additionally the Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 13-16, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Katseff and claims 6-12, 22, 23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katseff in view of Kalra. Although applicant disagrees, applicant has amended the claims to clarify the claimed subject matter.

Applicant's technology provides an effective way to stream multi-media content from a network server to a network client. In one embodiment, the network client contacts the server and selects multimedia content which is available via the server. The network client accepts a speed designation from the user which is relative to the original or default playback speed of the selected multimedia content. The server stores a number of individual media streams which when rendered form a composite media stream which corresponds to the user's selected multimedia content. In response to the speed designation from the user, the system modifies the timelines of the individual media streams and sends a composite media stream to the network client.

Claim 1 now recites a method involving storing individual media streams and sending a composite media stream to the network client. Additionally claims 1 and 5-7 have been amended in accordance with suggestions made during the August 25th

telephone conference to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection. Applicant finds no mention of the features of amended claim 1 in either of the references.

In rejecting claims, the Examiner points to Katseff, column 16, lines 33-37 showing the limitation of "having timelines modified by different degrees." (Office Action, March 31, 2008, p. 9.) Amended claim 1 now recites the media streams of the first type of having "different timelines." Katseff discloses media supplemental materials associated with a recorded presentation being marked with a time stamp or other counter, but it does not disclose different timelines. (Katseff, column 11, lines 54-56). Additionally none of the references teach or suggest combining individual media streams to create a composite media stream.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8372.

Please charge any deficiencies, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268768US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: September 30, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By *Rachael Vaughn*  
Rachael Vaughn  
Registration No.: 54,469  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
P.O. Box 1247  
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247  
(206) 359-8548  
(206) 359-9000 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant